

simple as Dubois (1984) implies. Recently an appeal has been made to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suppress the name *Mycetoglossina* and to conserve *Hemidactyliini* ... and I recommend maintaining the traditional taxonomy until the matter receives formal attention'. Such a statement is indeed very strange to read. Adopting a similar attitude would lead, for example, to rejection of the current Highway Code under the pretext that some users were criticizing aspects of it and that this Code might be changed in the future. No doubt it would be difficult to convince a traffic policeman with this argument; as long as a law has not been replaced by another one, it remains in force.

4. The aim of Smith & Wake's application is clearly to protect an invalid use first introduced by Wake (1966) five years after the publication of the 1961 Code, i.e. after the date limit fixed for the conservation of names which had 'won general acceptance'. *Mycetoglossina* Bonaparte, 1850 belongs to the category of names 'forgotten' simply because later authors have not done their work properly (Dubois et al., 1988, p. 148). Usually in science, when someone has made a mistake which is pointed out by another author, he has the modesty to remain silent, but apparently the recent tendency of a few zoologists to speak loud and attack the basic principles of the Code has had such strong effects on the community of zoologists that some of them lose all control and sense of proportion. The Commission should not be impressed by this and should reject this entirely unwarranted proposal.

Additional references

- Dubois, A. 1987. Again on the nomenclature of frogs. *Alytes*, 6: 27–55.
Dubois, A., Bour, R., Brygoo, E.-R., Lescure, J., Bouchet, P. & Tillier, S. 1988. Comment on the proposed suppression for nomenclature of three works by R.W. Wells & C.R. Wellington. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, 45: 146–149.
Holynski, R.B. 1994. Structure and function or: what kind of nomenclatural regulations do we need? *Crystal* (Zoology series) (Göd, Hungary), 2: 1–50.
Wake, D.B. 1993. Phylogenetic and taxonomic issues relating to salamanders of the family Plethodontidae. *Herpetologica*, 49: 229–237.

Comment on the proposed designation of a neotype for *Coelophysis bauri* (Cope, 1887) (Reptilia, Saurischia)
(Case 2840; see BZN 49: 276–279; 50: 147–151, 236–239, 291–294; 51: 48–51, 156–158)

Spencer G. Lucas

New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science, 1801 Mountain Road N.W., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104, U.S.A.

Adrian P. Hunt

Department of Geology, University of Colorado at Denver, Campus Box 172, P.O. Box 173364, Denver, Colorado 80217–3364, U.S.A.

Recent commentary in the BZN that recommends acceptance of Colbert et al.'s application may give the impression that most vertebrate paleontologists favor the application. Significantly, a growing literature by specialists currently doing original

research on Late Triassic theropod dinosaur taxonomy and phylogeny shows just the reverse. Recent articles in this vein by Olshevsky (1991), Cuny & Galton (1993) and Paul (1993) use the name *Rioarribasaurus* and reject the name *Coelophysus* for the Ghost Ranch dinosaur. Paul's article is particularly significant because it reveals the taxonomic complexity of the Ghost Ranch quarry sample (contra Colbert et al.'s claims). Also worthy of notice is the recently published *The Dinosaur Society's Dinosaur Encyclopedia* (Lessem & Glut, 1993), which uses the name *Rioarribasaurus* for the Ghost Ranch dinosaur (although ongoing debate over the name is noted). Contrary to the impression gained by reading the commentary in the BZN, it appears that many of those now working on Late Triassic theropods, as well as the popular literature on dinosaurs, are readily and rapidly recognizing the validity of *Rioarribasaurus* and the inadvisability of perpetuating the nomen dubium *Coelophysus* despite its erroneous use in an earlier literature.

Additional references

- Cuny, G. & Galton, P.M. 1993. Revision of the Airel theropod dinosaur from the Triassic-Jurassic boundary (Normandy, France). *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie Abhandlungen*, 187: 261–288.
- Lessem, D. & Glut, D.F. 1993. *The Dinosaur Society's Dinosaur Encyclopedia*. 533 pp. Random House, New York.
- Olshevsky, G. 1991. A revision of the Parainfraclass Archosauria Cope, 1869, excluding the advanced Crocodylia. *Mesozoic Meanderings*, 2: 1–196.

Comments on the proposed conservation of some mammal generic names first published in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale* (Case 2928; see BZN 51: 135–146)

(1) J.E. Hill

12 Penlee Close, Edenbridge, Kent TN8 5NA, U.K.

It appears to be generally accepted that M.J. Brisson's *Regnum Animale* (1762) is not consistently binominal and therefore should not be available for nomenclatural purposes. Nevertheless, no formal decision has yet been made and authors cite a number of generic names from this work, partly for this reason and because the names have long been credited to Brisson, and partly because the rejection of some (e.g. *Glis*, *Cuniculus*, *Tragulus*) would involve unwelcome and confusing changes at generic and possibly family level.

An increased level of publication of check lists in the past half century and the desire to produce a relatively stable (at least in the nomenclatural sense) listing of mammalian genera and species has led to the necessity of clarifying this issue, not least to achieve consistency of usage. The application does this, expanding and formalising the proposals first set out by Ellerman & Morrison-Scott (1951) and following the precedent already established by the conservation of *Odobenus* Brisson, 1762 for the walrus (Opinion 467). Approval will confirm the advantage of an early date for the names of several well-known genera, so ensuring the prospect of present and future stability.